Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: Sir, is it not a fact that these policemen in their new uniforms look extremely dull and not smart. Can you not avoid such things in future?

Khan Sahib Y. Muhammad Roshan Sahib Bahadur *(Commissioner of Police)*: The explanation is given in the answer.

Mr. K. S. Panicker *(Ezhuvas-Mukundapuram)*: Is there any reduction of price?

Khan Sahib Y. Muhammad Roshan Sahib Bahadur *(Commissioner of Police)*: No. It does not depend upon the price at all. It entirely depends upon the availability of stock.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE NAMES OF THE PANEL OF CHAIRMEN

Mr. President: I have to inform the House that Messrs C. V. Iyyu and A. Eachara Menon have been nominated as a panel of chairmen.

SUPPLEMENTARY GRANT No. 7—*(cont.)*

Rs. 1,250 under "31—Industries and Commerce Reserved—A.—Direction and Inspection—Miscellaneous"

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government)*: Of the several points raised by the Hon'ble Member who opposed this grant yesterday, so far as I can see, there is only one relevant issue, and that is, why is it that the Government did not call upon the lessees to pay the insurance premium. I shall just explain that point first. At the time when the Government decided to renew the lease there was no idea at all of a war risks insurance as will be seen from the dates which I will give you now. On 17th July 1942 the proclamation making the War Risks Insurance obligatory on all factories was promulgated. It was on 15th August 1942 that it was decided by the Government that the Potteries, the Cochin Government Press and the Tramway Workshop should all be insured, while the decision to renew the lease for another 17 years was made so early as January 1942 and the Managing Directors were informed of the decision of the Government so early as 21st January 1942. Thus at the time when the Government decided and they accepted all the conditions for the renewal, there was no idea of a War Risks Insurance at all. There was therefore no occasion for the Government to consider this matter when the draft deed was drawn up.

According to the Proclamation, it will be found that the duty to insure the factory and to pay the premium are cast upon the owner. I will just read the relevant portion.—

Section 5 (1). Every owner of a factory, except a factory belonging to Government or a factory exempted under section 11 from the provisions of this Proclamation, shall by such date as may be specified in this behalf by Government by notification in the Cochin Government Gazette, take out a policy of insurance against war risks issued in accordance with the War Risks (Factories) Insurance Scheme operated by the Government of India, whereby he is insured in respect of all property insurable under this Proclamation which appertains to the factory for a sum not less than the insurable value of such property.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon *(Chittur-Rural)*: But this is a Government institution. What is the provision there?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government)*: The exception in the case of Government factories has been subsequently taken away. So, this factory has to be insured by Government and Government is bound to pay the premium. If the Government does not pay and if the occupier pays the premium, under the law, he will be entitled to get it from the Government.

Mr. K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur)*: When was the deletion made?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government)*: I want notice.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: I may bring to the notice of the House that regard being had to the political situation and to the fact of the factories being left without being insured, it was thought that we should also fall into line with the general policy, because this State cannot afford to stand by and lose. The point for consideration at the time when even the notes of the Diwan were passed on to me, there was absolutely no idea of a War Risks Insurance, and there was a completed contract between the parties.

Mr. K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur)*: Government could have foreseen the possibility of insurance. When the war began, any reasonable man ought to have foreseen that there should have been a contingency of War Risks Insurance.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Rama Varmha Tampuran *(Secretary to Government):* Even the Government of India did not bring such a law into force. In the April meeting Mr. Salem raised some point.

Mr. K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* More than a year before, I understand there was a reference from the Government as to whether here the merchants will insure.

Rama Varmha Tampuran *(Secretary to Government):* It was goods, not factories.

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The Government of India brought this into force only in July. Anyway, when the agreement was entered into, there was no such law in force. As I submitted to the House the whole thing was finished before May this year, while the Proclamation came into force only in July and the idea of insuring this factory was actually decided by Government only on 15th August 1942.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* May I know when this fresh agreement was finally signed ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* It is being executed.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* The agreement is only being signed now ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The offer and acceptance and everything else have been completed in May. The deed has been finally approved also.

Mr. K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* If the lease is not made, cannot Government compel the lessee to pay the premium ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* Under the law, the owner of the factory is bound to pay the premium and the owner is the Government. Government is bound to pay and even if the occupier pays it, he pays it only as the agent of the Government.

Mr. K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* Then what was the deletion ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The exception with regard to Government factories. As I said, under law, we are bound to pay it. They have insured against fire for Rs. 50,000 and that premium they have to pay and they have agreed to pay.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Who is the lessee now ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The General Mercantile Corporation.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Are they changing hands ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The same Corporation is continuing as the lessee.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Are you aware that the Corporation is not working and somebody else is going to work.

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* We have no information. The original lease was for 3 years from 1st Thulam 1115 and it expired on 1st Thulam 1118. Now it is renewed for another 17 years.

The second point on which the mover wanted information was whether at the time this extension was thought of, it was advertised and tenders called for and the public given an opportunity to offer better terms. With regard to that, I wish to inform the House the condition in which the present lessees became the lessees. It was at a time when the institution was being run at a loss. Diwans after Diwans appointed experts from time to time and tried every possible means to revive the industry and see that it is worked on profitable basis. But all attempts

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

failed. At last, it came to the time of Sir Shanmukham Chetty who with his business instinct naturally thought that there was no scope at all for running it as a Government factory. Sir Shanmukham thought that either it should be leased out or it should be ended. He tried every possible means to get a good company to come and take it up on lease. It was with very great difficulty that he was able to persuade the present lessees to come forward, and he, characteristic of the South Indian Chetties, tried his level best to get the very best terms. He was able to get a rent of Rs. 3,000 a year. At the time when the lessees took it up there were a lot of manufactured articles remaining as dead stock in the factory costing about a lakh of rupees. Through the agency of these lessees, we were able to sell these goods and get Rs. 50,000, which otherwise we would not have been able to sell. Without default they are paying the rent every year in advance. In consideration of the services they have rendered in this connection, it was thought unfair that after 2½ years of their existence, the factory should be handed over to a third party, simply because by that time the factory began to show some sign of life.

Secondly, it was during these 2½ years that the cyclone took place. On account of that, the main structures had to be repaired, besides putting up many sheds that had tumbled down. They had to spend a lot of money for all this. That is another reason for not handing it over to a third party.

Now, before our considering the question in detail 3 or 4 of our Government experts were askedto investigate and see whether it is worth while in allowing the extension of the lease. The Technical expert, the Chief Engineer, the Finance expert the Comptroller, and the Director of Industries and Commerce, went and inspected the place and they submitted a joint report in which they definitely recommended to the Government the desirability of further extending the lease for a long period, on the same terms, subject, of course, to one change. May I read their report for the information of the House:

The extension of the period of the lease is essential when only will there be sufficient incentive on the part of the lessees to invest funds. The period may be further extended to 12 years.

During the last two years, the lessees have done good work. More space is necessary at the lay out of the factory is not satisfactory. A few sheds are in a dilapidated condition. They have to be renewed. Parts of engines and machines have to be replaced. All these involve both capital and revenue expenditure. According to the terms of the present agreement they have to do all repairs, etc., of a maintenance nature; but these charges are increasing. All items of capital expenditure are to be done by the lessees with the sanction of Government and depreciated value will be repaid to them at the end of the lease. These terms may remain as they are. But because of the lack of space, etc., increasing maintenance and other difficulties the annual rent may be reduced to Rs. 2,400 per annum.

They said that in lieu of the depreciation and the large investment, the rent would be Rs. 2,400 instead of Rs. 3,000 a year. The Diwan went round and examined the whole details of the factory and he also came to the conclusion that in fairness to the lessees the lease should be extended as recommended by the 3 officers and that the rent should be reduced to Rs. 2,400 and in the new agreement for the first 5 years the rent should be reduced to Rs. 2,400 and for the subsequent years the same old Rs. 3,000 should be paid. With this modification, it was extended for a period of 20 years including the 3 years. Three years we ran out and the balance is only 17 years. The Diwan was careful to see that while assuring the capitalists to have shares, it is a Cochin factory in the sense that 75 per cent of the non-labour staff should be Cochinites and also 90 per cent of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

labour should be necessarily Cochinites. These two conditions were stipulated in order to see that Cochin labour was employed. Today, out of 150 persons employed 99 are Cochinites. So, in the interests of Cochinites, it was thought necessary that these conditions should be satisfied by the Company. Again, it was stipulated that on the Directors' Board, there shall be 3 Cochinites. Thus, you will find there are three Cochinites sitting on the Board and they will be able to effectively guide the destinites of the concern. With regard to the capital investment made, a committee consisting of the Chief Engineer, the Director of Industries and Commerce and a representative of the Company should approve any investment and only after the previous sanction of the Government has been obtained they invest a single pie. Thus, Government has taken every possible safeguard to see that all capital investments are scrutinised by these Government officers.

In concluding the agreement with the Corporation, Government have also taken care to see that ample opportunities are reserved for Cochinites who are really interested in the management of the Potteries. Accordingly, out of the proposed increase in the capital of the Company by Rs. 58,000, shares to the value of Rs. 29,000 were reserved for six months for the public of Cochin to subscribe.

Mr. K. S. Panicker *(Ezhuvas-Mukundapuram):* Did you refer the matter to the Advisory Committee ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The Advisory Committee will discuss only questions of a general nature, but not questions of policy. It is very doubtful whether this subject ought to have been referred to an Advisory Committee. The Government in any case never thought that it was necessary that the matter should be placed before the Committee. As I said if any of the members had expressed the slightest desire that the matter should be placed before the Committee, certainly the matter would have been placed.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Who are the members of the Advisory Committee ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* Mr. Moni, Mr. Ismail Hajee Essa Sait and Mr. Popatlal Goverdhan Lalan.

So far as this question was concerned, there was no question of deliberately keeping it away from the purview of the members of the Advisory Committee. If they wanted the matter would have been placed before them.

So, I request the House to kindly vote for the demand.

Mr. M. L. Joseph *(Latin-Christians-Cranganur):* May I know whether the Mercantile Corporation or the Managing Agents of the company are the lessees ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The former are the lessees of the Cochin Potteries.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* What is the total amount of Government money involved ?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* Over 2 lakhs.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Is the activity of the Corporation confined to the Potteries alone ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran *(Secretary to Government):* Over one lakh is invested on the main part of the building. No one is using it. The biggest structure is never used at all. As a matter of fact the present lessees want those buildings to be pulled down to put up sheds where they can store their raw meterials. Those are now used only to stock materials. Though the capital expenditure according to the balance sheet of the Government may be very high that does not mean that the whole building is used by the lessees. They cannot touch the old building which cost the Government more than half the capital expenditure. Therefore we cannot really go by the capital expenditure and assess the interest or rental.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Nellayi):* The old buildings are not leased now?

Rama Varmha Tampuran *(Secretary to Government):* They are leased. No one can use it. It is in such a dilapidated condition. So all that money is absolute waste. As a matter of fact the present lessees want those buildings to be pulled down.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* May I know whether the bungalow which was given to the expert is leased to the company?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* No. The Tramway Engineer is staying in that building.

Mr. V. N. Damodaran Nambiar *(Trippunittura):* May I know the total number of Directors in the lessee company?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* I want notice.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Are there Cochinites on the present Board of Directors?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* Yes. Mr. A. N. Menon was the Managing Director.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* He is not.

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* He was.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Who is the present Managing Director?

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* One Mr. Pazhaniappa Chettiar.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* At the outset I wish to give a humble suggestion to the Government. The Chief Secretary explained just now that the big structure is in a very dilapidated condition and it is almost a snake-farm. So the Government will do well to demolish the building outright so that there will be an appreciable abatement of capital and to that extent we need pay only a lesser premium. So my humble suggestion is that the old structure may be pulled down.

Rama Varmha Tampuran *(Secretary to Government):* Those buildings have been, condemned by several people. To pull them down after spending a huge amount over 1½ lakhs and at a cost of about 5 to 6 thousand rupees, is rather bad economy and it is better to allow it to stand for a few more years. When I visited, while I was the Comptroller of Accounts, they said that they were experimenting and as a matter of fact they had failed. They filled the kiln with the raw material. Probably another expert will come and say that the structure is rather good. It is therefore rather bad economy to pull it down.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* If you do not demolish keep it in good repair.

Rama Varmha Tamppuran *(Secretary to Government):* To get it in good repair means you have to spend a large sum of money, and nobody is going to use the building now. So the structure may be kept there for some time more. Of course there is no objection to consider the point of pulling it down. The reduction in the premium that we can expect by that will only be a very small small amount.

Mr. President: I assure the Hon'ble Member that the matter of pulling down the structure will be looked into.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandara Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* I base my opposition mainly on the ground that the Government had not the wisdom to refer this matter to the committee, which is constituted to go into these matter. The Hon'ble Joint Secretary to Government sought to shift the blame completely on to the shoulders of the members of the committee. I do not wish to be dragged into a controversy as to who should bear the blame the members of the committee or the Government. But I take it, Sir, that when the Government constitutes a particular committee, it is the duty of the Government to refer all relevant

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

matters to that committee. Otherwise, I don't find any meaning in Government constituting committees. If after constituting these committees Government do not follow a uniform policy, that is the very salutary principle of referring all matters to the relevant committees, it means that all these committees are meaningless and costly ornaments and nothing more. Therefore, the explanation given by the Joint Secretary that the members of the committee referred to did not deem fit to moot this subject in the meeting, is not satisfactory.

Sir, I have gone through the proceedings of the Committee during the previous years and I find that the Government had referred various minor matters to the Committee. I have found minor subjects like bee-keeping referred to that Committee. I think Sir, that all subjects great and small connected with industries and commerce should invariably be referred to that Committee and that the Government should not be satisfied with referring matters like poultry-farming, bee-keeping, toddy-tapping or barbering to this committee and sit quiet when matters of this volume come up for decision. So that is the main reason why I oppose this demand.

Now Sir, I am led to conclude that the Government is in a very happy frame of mind and is under the impression that they have entered into a profitable bargain in the matter of the Chalakkudi Potteries. The present lessees have worked the potteries for three years. They have been paying an annual rental of Rs. 3,000 and now the officers appointed by the Government have gone into the question and recommended the reduction of the annual return to Rs. 2,400 and the Government without referring the matter to the Committee and without raising this matter in the Council have extended the period by 17 years,—a pretty long period Sir.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* The agreement has not been signed.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* Whether it has been finally signed or not, they are in duty bound to abide by the draft agreement. That is their contention. What I have to say is this. This is a commercial concern and so far as this matter is concerned the Government is just like any other magnate of a commercial concern. If it is possible to reopen the question, call for tenders give wide publicity in the papers and give the lease to the individual or corporation who offers you a pie more than Rs. 2,400. You owe that duty to the taxpayers of this State. It is my information, Sir, that several respectable people of this State approached the Government with the offer of taking up and working this factory and furnishing bigger security.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon *(Chittur-Rural):* Where were they three years before?

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* Three years back there was no war.

Mr. V. K. Bhaskara Menon *(Cranganur):* Yes, there was.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* Not in this part of the world, at any rate.

Whatever it is, I feel, I am justified in opposing this demand and I call upon this House to throw out this demand outright.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* Sir, I support this motion. After hearing the very elaborate and lengthy statement made by the Joint Secretary and the subsequent statement by the Secretary to Government, I am fully satisfied that the Government have done their work quite efficiently in this matter. I belong to Chalakkudi and I know something about the history of the Potteries. Hon'ble Members may get uneasy when they think of the history of the Potteries. But it is not on account of the mistake of the present Government or the Government immediately preceding. Our Government have been bungling over this Pottery business. It was started a quarter of a century ago, more than two lakhs of rupees were spent for and I think an Australian Expert was brought down on a salary of Rs. 900. He was a very clever man. The Government thought that on such salary he could not be maintained and he was removed. Successive Managers were appointed by Government on lesser salary and we got less efficient men. The result is that Potteries were left in a ruinous condition. We cannot get experienced men like the first manager on a salary of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150. They ought to be paid the salary they demand. Ultimately we got fed up with these Potteries. After spending 2 lakhs of rupees everybody was complaining. A gigantic building had been constructed. The first manager had some plans when this big building was constructing, but unfortunately he was sent away. That was I say, the result of the bungling of the previous Government. There is no use of blaming this Government for what their predecessors have done. I know, as a matter of fact, that the people of the locality want this institution to be worked and to be developed. They submitted a printed memorandum and they said that in the best interests of the people of the State it is better to hand over the Potteries to a commercial concern. Even the labourers agreed that it should be handed over to some experts. If you want that institution to prosper,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

if you want to develop it, it should be handed over to some expert companies. I think Sir Shanmukham on account of his commercial knowledge invited some people and handed over the institution on three years' lease. I was present for the opening ceremony, Then we found mountains of these jars accumulated, stock worth about a lakh of rupees. We saw an Everest of *Itturutties*. The Joint Secretary said that the lessees have disposed of these old jars and they have done a service to the Government and we ought to appreciate that service. If it is in a ruinous condition nobody will care for it. If somebody is going to work it at once so many people will come forward and say "I want it". It is but human nature. I do not know anything about the present lessee. They came there and improved the Potteries. They have done tremendous work and they ought to be rewarded by the Government for what they have done. I am saying what the people of my constituency feel about this. Now the complaint is that we have given this to a foreigner, and without inviting tenders. When it was in a bad condition nobody cared for it and when it is now working satisfactorily everybody wants it. They are now working it on lease and they have been paying the rent regularly. It will be foolish on the part of the Government to hand over the Potteries to another doubtful lessee whose antecedents we do not know. Why should you dismiss a lessee so long as he pays rent regularly and looks after the property well. No prudent man will do it.

Mr. M. L. Joseph *(Latin-Christians-Cranganur)* : May I know from the hon'ble member whether the Government before deciding to hand over the potteries to this concern called for tenders to know whether there was any other corporation or Company to take it or whether they simply want and invited this corporation?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)* : The original lease was for three years. At that time nobody was prepared to take it up. Sir Shanmukham persuaded the present lessees to take it on lease. I am speaking of conditions prevailing in 1115. At that time every body thought it was a losing concern. This House also during the previous budget sessions when this subject came up for discussion, did not offer any constructive suggestion. In that hopeless situation the present lessees took it on lease. By their efforts they improved it. Now there are people who want to get in. I think no responsible landlord would lease the same to another lessee; much less a Government. It is very unfair. Therefore my respectful submission is that the Government have done well in extending the term of the lease.

The next point is why it was given for 20 years inclusive of the first lease of 3 years. If you want that institution to improve you must ask people to invest money. If the lease is terminable after three years will there be anybody to invest money over it. If you lease a property for 3 years, will that tenant spend money for improving it. I find the object of the people of the State is that the institution should improve, that it should develop. How can we achieve it is the next question. There are only two ways. Either the Government should manage it or some others should be made to manage it. The Government have already bungled. So there is no other go but to lease it to another person and the Government have leased it to a corporation three years back after full investigation. Those people have done their duties well and every body is feeling alright. The people of the locality are quite satisfied. Therefore I would only congratulate the Government for what they have done. The Diwan has gone personally to this place and inspected it. I have nothing to say against the Government. I think that the labourers there are to be properly treated.

Another point referred to by the Hon'ble Member for Nemmara is that it was not referred to the Advisory Committee. After all it is not a question of merit. So far as I am concerned I do not belong to any party. I cannot support the proposition that since this was not referred to the Advisory Committee, this supplementary grant should be rejected. If the terms of the lease are fair and they were entered into after due consideration of all the circumstances, why should we reject that lease because of one technicality—it is not even a technicality. There is no rule saying that everything which is to be placed before the Council should be referred to the Committee. Even in 1110 when the advisory committees were constituted, I said that they are unnecessary. What is their function? Simply to give advice. Now suppose this matter was referred to the Committee and they rejected it. The Government according to their powers could enter into the lease. These committees are quite useless and occasionally they are mischievous also. One advisory committee decided against giving educational concession to the depressed class converts. That committee went beyond their powers and did all this mischief. Therefore I say this irregularity, even if it is an irregularity, should be condoned.

I would only request the Government to see that the interests of the labourers working in the Potteries are very well looked after.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

*മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: മിസ്റ്റർ പ്രസിഡൻറ് സർ, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ജോയൻറ് സെക്രട്ടറി അവർകളുടെ പ്രസംഗത്തിൽ, ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിൻെറ അപ്രാപ്തി വെളിപ്പെട്ടു കാണാനതിൽ എനിക്ക് അതിയായ വ്യസനമുണ്ട്. ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിൽ നിന്ന് പല വിദഗ്ദ്ധന്മാരെ വരുത്തി, പല പരീക്ഷണങ്ങളും നടത്തീട്ടും, അതു സംബന്ധിച്ച്, തോൽമയാണ് ഉള്ളതെന്ന് ഗവമ്മെണ്ട് സമ്മതിച്ചതിൽ എനിക്ക് വളരെ വ്യസനമുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിനെക്കാൾ വളരെ പ്രാപ്തിയുള്ള വ്യക്തികൾ നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിലുണ്ടെന്ന് അദ്ദേഹം സമ്മതിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു. കുറച്ചുമുമ്പെ ഈ രാജ്യത്തിൻെറ നട്ടെല്ലായ ടഷറിയെ ഈ നിയമസഭയോട് ആലോചിക്കാതെ, പൊതുജനങ്ങളോട് ആലോചിക്കാതെ, ഒരു വിദേശ ബാങ്കിനെ ഗവമ്മെണ്ട് ഏല്പിച്ചു. അതു് അഞ്ചു കൊല്ലത്തേക്കായിരുന്നു. അതെസമയത്തുതന്നെ നമ്മ കൊല്ലത്തേക്ക് നമ്മുടെ പോട്ടറിയും ഏല്പിച്ചു. എന്നാൽ ൫ കൊല്ലം കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ നമ്മുടെ ടഷറിയുടേയും, നമ്മ കൊല്ലം കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ നമ്മുടെ പോട്ടറിയുടേയും കാലക്കേട് തീരുമെന്നായിരുന്ന ഞങ്ങളുടെ വിശ്വാസം. എന്നാൽ അതിനു വിപരീതമായി കൊച്ചിക്കാർ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിട്ടും കൊടുക്കാതെ ആ വിദേശീയക്കുതന്നെ പോട്ടറീസ്സ് ൧൫ കൊല്ലത്തേക്കു ഏല്പിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുകയാണു ചെയ്തതു്. അതു ഗവമ്മെണ്ട് ൯൯ കൊല്ലത്തേക്ക് എന്നാക്കിയില്ലല്ലൊയെന്നുള്ള ആശ്വാസമാണ് എനിക്കുള്ളതു്. ഗവമ്മെണ്ട് ഇങ്ങിനെ നിരുത്തരവാദമായി, ജനങ്ങളോട് യാതൊരു ഉത്തരവാദിത്വബോധവുമില്ലാതെ, ഇങ്ങിനെയുള്ള സംഗതികളിൽ കൈകടത്തി പ്രവൃത്തിക്കുവാൻ തുടങ്ങുകയാണെങ്കിൽ, തീച്ചയായും പൊതുജനങ്ങളുടെ അപ്രീതി ഗവമ്മെണ്ട് സമ്പാദിക്കേണ്ടതായിവരും. ഈ പോട്ടറിയിൽ കൊച്ചി ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിൻെറ ചിലവിന്മേൽ ടെയിൻ ചെയ്യിപ്പിച്ചു വരുത്തിയ ഒരാൾ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു. അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്ന് കൊച്ചി രാജ്യത്തെ "ക്ലൈ" സംബന്ധിച്ചു് നല്ല പരിചയവും, പഴക്കവുമുണ്ടായിരുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഈ മൺ വ്യവസായശാല ഒരു വിദേശീയ കമ്പനിയെ ഏല്പിച്ചുകൊടുത്തപ്പോൾ അതിലുണ്ടായിരുന്ന വിദഗ്ദ്ധനെ, ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിൻെറ ചിലവിന്മേൽ ടെയിൻ ചെയ്യിപ്പിച്ച ആ വിദഗ്ദ്ധനെ, പിരിച്ചയച്ചു് ആ സ്ഥാനത്തു് തിരുവിതാംകൂറുകാരനായ ഒരാളെ നിയമിച്ചു. ആ തിരുവിതാംകൂറുകാരൻ എവിടേയോ പോയപ്പോൾ ആ സ്ഥാനത്തു് വേറെ ഒരാളെ കൊണ്ടുവന്നുവെച്ചു. എന്നാൽ നാട്ടുകാരനും, ഈ നാട്ടിലെ "ക്ലൈ" യെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു നല്ല പരിചയം ഉള്ള ഒരാളും, ഗവമ്മെണ്ട ചിലവിന്മേൽ ടെയിൻ ചെയ്യിപ്പിച്ചു വരുത്തിയതുമായ ആളെ ആ സ്ഥാനത്തു നിയമിക്കുവാൻ പാട്ടക്കാക്കു് സന്മനസ്സുണ്ടായില്ല. ഒന്നേകാലണക്കു് വിറ്റിരുന്ന പാത്രങ്ങൾക്കു് അവർ രണ്ടണക്കാണു് വിറ്റുവരുന്നതു്. ഇതു കൊണ്ടു നഷ്ടത്തിന്നു് ഒരിക്കലും അവകാശമില്ല.

പിന്നെ കൊട്ടുകാറുമൂലം പലവിധ നഷ്ടങ്ങളും ഉണ്ടായിയെന്നു് ഇവിടെ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. കൊട്ടുകാറുമൂലം മുശയിലിടാതെ വെച്ചിരുന്ന പാത്രങ്ങളും ഉടഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു പിന്നെയും "ക്ലൈ" യായിട്ടുവരും. അതുകൊണ്ടു് പിന്നെയും പാത്രങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടാക്കാവുന്നതാണു്. പണിക്കുറവു തീർന്ന പാത്രങ്ങളും ഉടഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിലെ അവക്കു് നഷ്ടംവരുവാൻ വഴിയുള്ളൂ. അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഒരു വിദഗ്ദ്ധകമ്മിറ്റിയെവച്ചു് പരിശോധിച്ചാൽ അറിയാവുന്നതാണു്. ആവകയിൽ ഒരു മന്തരോ, നാന്തരോ രൂപായിൽ കൂടുതൽ നഷ്ടം വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടായിരിക്കയില്ലെന്നാണു് എൻെറ വിശ്വാസം.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. ഈച്ചരമേനോൻ: പുര വീണല്ലോ! ആ നഷ്ടത്തിനോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: ഈ പോട്ടറീസ്സിൽ ഈ പാട്ടക്കാരെ ചില കരാറു പണികൾ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിൽ നിന്നും ഏല്പിക്കുകയുണ്ടായി. ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു വക മരങ്ങളും അവിടെയുണ്ടായിരുന്നതു് എല്ലാമെടുത്തു അവർ പണി നടത്തുകയും, കരാറുപ്രകാരമുള്ള പണം അവർ വാങ്ങിക്കുകയും ചെയ്തതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് ഈ നിയമസഭയിലുണ്ടായ പ്രക്ഷോഭണങ്ങളും ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് വിസ്മരിച്ചിരിക്കയില്ലെന്നു് ഞാൻ വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു. അന്നു് അതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് പറഞ്ഞതു് ഒരു ഉരുട്ടുമിരട്ടായ മറുപടിയാണു്. മൂന്നു കൊല്ലത്തേക്കു് പാട്ടത്തിനു കൊടുത്തിരുന്ന പോട്ടറീസ്സിൻെറ കാലാവധി കഴിയുന്നതിന്നുമുമ്പു് അതു നടത്തുവാൻ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിരുന്ന കൊച്ചീക്കാക്കു് കൊടുക്കാതെ, പിന്നെയും ഇവക്കുതന്നെ കൊടുക്കുവാനുണ്ടായ കാരണമെന്താണെന്നാണു് എനിക്കു മനസ്സിലാകാത്തതു്. കൊച്ചിക്കാക്കു് ഇതിൽ വൈദഗ്ദ്ധ്യമില്ലെന്നു വിചാരിച്ചിട്ടാണു് ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് ഇതു വിദേശീയരെ ഏല്പിച്ചതെന്നു് ഞങ്ങൾക്കു് ആദ്യം തോന്നിയതു്. എന്നാൽ ഇതേവരെ പാട്ടത്തിനു കൊടുത്തിരുന്ന സം

* Speech not corrected by the hon'ble member

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ഖ്യക്കുതന്നെ ഇതു് എറെറടുത്തു നടത്തുവാൻ ഇവിടെ ആളുണ്ടായിരുന്ന സ്ഥിതിക്കു്, അതി നേക്കാൾ കുറഞ്ഞ ഒരു സംഖ്യക്കു്, അതായതു് ൨,൫൦൦ ക. ക്കു പിന്നെയും ആ വിദേശീ യ കമ്പനിയെ എല്പിക്കുവാൻ കാരണമെന്താണെന്നാണു് ഞാൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നതു്. അപ്പോൾ ഏതെങ്കിലുംവിധത്തിൽ ഒരു വ്യക്തിയെ സഹായിക്കണമെന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ, അവരെ സഹായിക്കുകയെന്നുള്ള ഒരു മനസ്ഥിതിയാണു ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു വെച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്നതു്. നാ ടിന്റെ ക്ഷേമത്തേയൊ, ജനങ്ങളുടെ ക്ഷേമത്തേയൊ, നമ്മുടെ ട്രഷറിയുടെ പൂരണത്തേയൊ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് ഗണ്യമാക്കുന്നില്ല. പല അവസരങ്ങളിലും നാട്ടുകാരെ വിസ്മരിച്ചു് വിദേശീയ ർക്കു് മുൻഗണ കൊടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു് പല സംഗതികളും പ്രവൃത്തിച്ചുകാണുന്നുണ്ടു്. ബഹുമാന പ്പെട്ട ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു് സിക്രട്ടറി അവർകൾ പറഞ്ഞതു് സപ്പ്ക്കാവായി കിടന്നിരുന്ന കെട്ടിട ങ്ങൾ അവരുടെ കൈവശം ഏല്പിച്ചപ്പോൾ അവർ അതെല്ലാം പൊളിച്ചുകളഞ്ഞു് പുതിയ കെട്ടിടങ്ങൾ പണിയിപ്പിച്ചുവെന്നാണു്. എന്നാൽ അതു "തീറാക്കുലിക്കു കൊടുത്തിരുന്ന പഴയ അവതിയായതുപോലെ" ആകാതെയിരുന്നാൽ മതി.

മിസ്റ്റർ വി. കെ. കുട്ടി: ഇതിനെല്ലാം എഗ്രിമെണ്ടില്ലേ?

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: എഗ്രിമെണ്ടോടുകൂടിതന്നെയാണു് തീറാക്കുലിക്കു കൊടുത്ത പഴയവിന്റെ കഥയും. ൨,൫൦൦ ക. കിട്ടുമെന്നു പറയുന്നുണ്ടു്. അതിൽ ഇൻഷ്വ റൻസ് എമൌണ്ടു് പോയാൽ നമുക്കെന്താണു് കിട്ടുവാനുള്ളതു്? ഈ സംഖ്യയുംകൂടി അ വർ വഹിക്കേണമെന്നു അവരോടു ആവശ്യപ്പെടാമായിരുന്നു. ഇതിനു് വലിയൊരു ദീഘ്ഘ ദർശനമൊന്നും ആവശ്യമില്ല. ഇതിൽനിന്നു് നമ്മുടെ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിന്റെ ഹ്രസ്വബുദ്ധി തെ ളിയുന്നുണ്ടു്. ഈ ക്രൂ കൊല്ലത്തേക്കു ഇതു് ഏല്പിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുവാനുണ്ടായ പ്രധാന കാരണം എന്താണെന്നു ഞങ്ങൾക്കു ഇതേവരെ മനസ്സിലാക്കുവാൻ സാധിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. പതിനേഴം മൂന്നം കൂടി ൨൦ കൊല്ലത്തേക്കു് ഏല്പിച്ചുകൊടുത്തുവെന്നുപറഞ്ഞു. എന്നാൽ എന്തുകൊണ്ടു് അ വർക്കു് ൻൻ കൊല്ലത്തേക്കു ഏല്പിച്ചുകൊടുത്തില്ല. അവർക്കു പാട്ടത്തിനു കൊടുത്തതിനുശേ ഷം പോട്ടറീസ്സിലെ തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ വിഭാഗതകൾ വഷ്ടിച്ചുവരുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു് ഗവമ്മെ ണ്ടിനു ഇരിക്കപൊറുതിയില്ലാതായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അവിടെ ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന സാധനങ്ങൾക്കു് വില കൂടുതൽ കിട്ടുന്നുണ്ടു്. എന്നാൽ ഭക്ഷണസാധനങ്ങളുടെ വില വളരെ വർദ്ധിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ഇ ക്കാലത്തു് പോട്ടറീസ്സിലെ തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ കൂലി വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ പല സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലും തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കു് കൂലി വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. സൈക്ലോൺമൂലം കേടുസംഭ വിച്ച ചില സ്ഥലത്തെ ഫോട്ടോയെടുത്തു് അവർ ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിനെ കാണിച്ചു. ഫോട്ടോ കണ്ട പ്പോൾ വലിയ നാശം വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു വിചാരിച്ചു് ഗവമ്മെണ്ടു പണവും കൊടുത്തു. ഇതു് നാടൊട്ടുക്കു സംഭവിച്ച ഒരു നാശമാണു്. രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ഐശ്വര്യത്തെ കെടുത്തുന്നതും, രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ അഭിമാനത്തിനു് ക്ഷതം വരുത്തുന്നതുമാണു് ഇത്തരം പ്രവൃത്തികളും എന്നുള്ള വിചാരം ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിനു മേലാലെങ്കിലും ഉണ്ടാകണമെന്നാണു് എനിക്കു് ഇതിനെ സംബ ന്ധിച്ചു ഗവമ്മെണ്ടിനോടു പറയുവാനുള്ളതു്.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: Sir, to me it appears that we are travelling far beyond the scope of the motion. The motion before the House is, as I stated yesterday, whether the Government should be granted a sum of Rs. 1,250 tor insuring the Cochin Potteries. As I understand it this is the only matter which is within the scope of the motion. We are wandering far into the history of a quarter of a century and we are pocking up all sorts of extraneous matters and people are getting angry over past history for which nobody here is responsible. Unless it be for the sake of academic interest or for throwing mud on past regimes with which we are not concerned today this discussion can have no object. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to circumscribe the limits of the discussion of the point at issue. Therefore, the only question is whether an amount of Rs. 1,250 should be granted for the purpose of insuring the Potteries. I think I am right and the Joint Secretary will support me when I say that unless we insure it under the War Risks Insurance Scheme it has to cease to exist. Therefore, the whole question is this. Shall we do away with the Potteries altogether? Therefore the simple question is this: Whether the Cochin Potteries should be demolished. Unless you insure it under the rules you have to eliminate it altogether and you cannot continue the work there. You cannot fight against a law which is accepted throughout the whole of India.

Mr. K. S. Panicker *(Ezhuvas-Mukundapuram)*: We are not against the company being insured.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: He is not against insurance. Then what is he against?

Mr. K. S. Panicker *(Ezhuvas-Mukundapuram)*: The lessees must pay.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: The Hon'ble Member is willing to grant this sum of Rs. 1,250. Then what is the occasion for all this anxiety and all these threats that the Government will fall into unpopularity and that a wild cry will be raised against the Government and the Government will be demolished. The matter is very simple, something like a simple problem in arithmetics which is taught in the first class. They want Rs. 1250. What for is that amount? For insuring the Cochin Potteries. Why do you insure it. Because if you don't insure it it will have to be demolished. Then the question is should you demolish it. It comes to that. The whole proposition is reduced to this simpe question. The Hon'ble Member said that it should not be demolished. Another Hon'ble Member said "I am opposing the motion; but at the same time I am willing that the Potteries should be insured". You are arguing against yourself.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam)*: The matter has not been referred to the Committee.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: That is beyond the scope of the present motion. You must bring another motion.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam)*: If your position is accepted no discussion is possible.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: Every discussion is possible. My anxiety is we must get on. On a supplementary motion we are going into the past history of this institution. We are going into the question whether the Advisory Committee has been consulted. All those questions are far beyond this motion. If you are willing to grant this amount say you are willing. So far as these matters are concerned it is the right of every member to bring a motion to discuss it. You could have done it some time back.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam)*: On a point of order, Sir. The Chair has allowed discussion on these aspects of this matter but the relevancy of which the Hon'ble Member now questions and thereby he is questioning the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. President: Although these aspects are not relevant to the particular motion in hand I have allowed a free discussion on the subject.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: It seems to me that the matter is to be confined strictly within the limits of the discussion and the Chair has been indulgent enough to you and not to me. What I say is that the indulgence has been to you. I am complaining against the Chair that the Chair has been too indulgent to you.

Though irrelevant, since the matter has been discussed here I ask the question why foreigners should not be allowed to take it up if proper Cochinite lessees are not available. You are complaining against British Indians who have been allowed to come in as lessees of a factory which was in disuse, when our Diwan is begging at the doors of every province of British India for rice for feeding you. How does it come with grace from any one of you to complain against British Indians who come as lessees of a factory which was in disuse.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam)*: That aspect was not stressed upon.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: That was stressed upon, not by you, but by the Member for Mukundapuram Ezhuvas. How can you quarrel against British Indians being encouraged here when you are begging for food in British India? Secondly, which Cochinite has been prepared to take up such industries in Cochin State? For instance, take the Planting Industry. Which Cochinite is there to go to Nelliampathi or Malakkipara?

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam)*: Except you.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters)*: In my humble way, I must think. You must give me credit for that. I go there and see what others are doing. You complain against foreign capital? How many coolies are being employed at very favourable terms, in Mr. Walmesley's estate? Can you complain of foreign capital there? Jungles which you are not prepared to develop have been developed by others to the good of the country. To me, there is absolutely neither grace nor sense in that proposition. To me it appears that the barriers at least between Cochin and British India should disappear. The world has come to that stage when President Roosevelt and Minister Churchill and everybody who is conversant with world affairs and tendencies, are saying that all barriers between nations must disappear. Yesterday, I was reading a declaration by Mr. Sumner Welles that they will see that no portion on the surface of the earth is in distress for want of food. That is the position. When barriers between nations are disappearing, we are trying to create an artificial barrier at Shoranur, at Vadakuncherri and Arukutty. And, after all you are like frogs in a well in the Cochin State. If you want food, you have to go to Shoranur and beg for food. I want to make it clear that this cry of foreign capital and foreigners directed

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

against at least British India and Travancoreans should never be raised. I admit that it is beyond the scope of the motion.

As regards the motion, I am in entire agreement with the Joint Secretary that it is necessary to insure the Potteries and that money should be granted for insuring the Potteries.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Sir, I will certainly vote with the government for the grant of the money which the Government say they want. But the question is, are we justified in keeping the Potteries and spending this money, or is it time that we shall spend no more money upon the Potteries from the public treasury. That is the only question at issue. My friend says that the past should not be looked into, and that the conduct of others should not be looked into. All these things have to be looked into. How can you decide a thing without knowing what has gone before? What are the premises on which decisions can be based? We know the history of the Pottereis and the Tanneries which were started together almost. The Tanneries has gone into liquidation and the whole money that the Government invested has been lost. Two lakhs of money is now said to be the book capital that is invested in the Potteries. Of that, certain portions are lying dilapidated and certain other portions are being used by the lessees. You want to spend Rs. 1,250 to insure that, as a compulsory insurance. I do not know why it should come to the House if it is a compulsory insurance? But having brought it here, we must see whether it is rightly or wrongly spent. Rs. 1,250 goes to the insurance. What is the balance that you get? Rs. 1,150. That works up to Rs. 95—13—4 a month. That is the return that you are going to get for two lakhs of money spent from the public treasury. Is it worth while?

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* After the war, there will be no necessity for insurance.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* You are going to get Rs. 95—13—4 for the first five years. After that what are you going to get? You will get Rs. 250. Let us hope that the war will end before that. Now, the question is, why should government spend this money. If it is a profitable concern, as it must be in any branch of business, certainly it will pay the lessee to pay the insurance and much more. I am sure the lessee will himself pay this money, if the government insist upon it. And I have understood the Joint Secretary to say that the matter is not absolutely concluded although most of the terms have been agreed.

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* The terms have been settled.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Nobody thought of this insurance at the time, three years ago. It is a war condition that has come, we are entitled to take advantage of that. Therefore, the lessee may very well be asked to pay.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* Without offer and acceptance?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* What is the offer and acceptance? What I am saying is, is it possible to shift the burden to the lessees? I think the profit-making motive of the lessee himself will induce him to pay this money, considering the discussion of this House. He should be told that members are even for scraping it. Can you not make Rs. 95 profit a month. Surely, you can rent those buildings out in parts and make Rs. 95 or Rs. 100. Supposing the agreement is not concluded, we can lease it out.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* 150 coolies are being worked there.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* That is outside the point.

Mr. President: I may inform the Hon'ble Member that it is an important point—the all—important point. It is providing labour.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* You must provide as much for labour as possible. I have no objection. I will vote with the government. The only point that I am trying to stress is that there will be profit from jars. Parry & Co., are making much profit out of jars, whereas the jars are mounting up as "Mount Everest" according to the Hon'ble Member for Chalakkudi in the Potteries!

Mr. K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* How can the government go upon the agreement?

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* Everybody is supporting and speaking against.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* Then there was no necessity for any discussion at all. Even for the grant coming here, if it is a compulsory insurance that you have brought here. We are however bound to make our criticisms. It is left to you to accept or reject them. We are not responsible for the agreement; we are not parties to the agreement. We are now asked to blindly give the money. All right, take the money. I have no objection. Government should fulfil the responsibility. I will vote with the government; but it is necessary to see whether there

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

are any methods by which this lessee himself voluntarily pays the premium. You need not compel. It is enough if you say: Look here, there is public criticism; there is the Legislative Council criticising that you have been given it, as a cheap bargain. We must avoid such criticisms. Rs. 1,250 a month for a big factory employing 200 to 300 people and turning out much work is not figure. The present man who has come here is a very clever business man. Are you aware that Mr. A. N. Menon is not going to run the factory? I know from Mr. A. N. Menon that he has washed his hands off this. These people are business men. They would not mind paying this money if government only try for it.

Mr. K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* Even if they have no obligation to pay, will they pay?

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* When the government tries to get the money, business people will never go against them. They will have to get so many concessions in so many ways. Business people must go with the government if they want to prosper. Otherwise, governments know how to deal with them. There are so many people employed in the Rubber Factory at Trivandrum. That was not making any profit at all. Immediately after Government ceased management, last year they made a profit of Rs. 7,00,000 (7 lakhs). You say two lakhs worth of jars were there and through the agency of the new lessees, you were able to make Rs. 50,000. Government say we do not know the market. Quite so. Therefore, any business proposition handed by Government will not be a paying proposition. I have been against that policy right through. You cannot expect a carpenter to make a pair of shoes nor a cobbler to make a 'good chair'. Similarly Government should do Government work. If the Government go to handle the business, enthusiasm will carry you. You will pay Rs. 900 to Kuhennel. He could not get Rs. 250. He made money. He said the contract is only for three years. I have done my best; now you manage. You tried so many hands. After a quarter of a century, I asked Sir Shanmukham Chetty what the net result was? He simply said, "A huge loss". Why go on with losing concerns? Let us save as much money as we can. Our present Diwan is very careful in spending money and he is spending for the good of the people. Rs. 1,250 saved will be a good sum. If it is possible, I request the Government to take persuasive measures and see whether the lessee could not agree to it. After all it is a compulsory insurance. I am sure so many lessees will come. I certainly vote with the Government. Nevertheless, I will request you to ask the lessee to bear this burden and save us from the bargain. I have no quarrel with the Government. After all, the non-officials on this side are no better than the officials on that side. They are equally Cochinites; they have got Cochin's interest as much. And we have got an impartial Diwan who is not a Cochinite. He does his best and acts for us. We are bound to tell you our feelings and suggestions and leave it to you to adopt or to reject it. But I request the Government to make an attempt to see whether the present management who are rich people and who are business people and who know how to market and how to make money and to make cent per cent profit—nay 4 or 5 hundred per cent profit during the next 17 years. I have no doubt the Potteries will prosper under them and incidental advantages we get like the provision for labourers, provision for a certain number of clerks—99 per cent of Cochinites. In that way we are benefitted indirectly, although we do not get any return for our money directly. Therefore I request the Government to try whether this burden of this insurance amount could not be shifted on to the shoulders of the new lessees.

Mr. President: I may inform the Hon'ble Member that the Government have no objection for negotiating with the lessees. Meanwhile the insurance must be effected. There is no objection to negotiate.

Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar *(Chittur-Tattamangalam):* In view of the assurance from the Chair, and on behalf of my party, I assure the Government that we would remain neutral.

Demand put and carried

1. THE COCHIN MUNICIPAL ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* I move that the Cochin Municipal Act (Amendment) Bill be taken up and finally passed.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I second it.

Motion put and carried

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly